(Spl.-H.C.A.S.,C.D.,78-e)

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 352 OF 2004.

Office Note, Office Memoranda of Quorum, appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders.	Court's or Judge's Orders

Mr. S.M. Singbal, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. A.N.S. Nadkarni, Advocate General with Mr. S.R. Rivonkar, Government Advocate for the Respondents.

CORAM : P.V. HARDAS &
N.A. BRITTO, JJ.

DATE : 16TH AUGUST, 2004.

P.C.:

After hearing Mr. Singbal, learned counsel for the petitioner, for some time, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner had submitted an application dated 7.5.2004 before the Inquiry Officer, contending therein that the inquiry should be held in abeyance till the decision of the criminal case, pending before the Special Judge, Panaji, under the Prevention of Corruption Act. According to the petitioner, no

orders have been passed by the Inquiry Officer on this application. Subsequent to the filing of this application, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner had also filed another application on 18.6.2004 raising similar grounds. The said application dated 18.6.04 has also not been decided. The learned counsel for the petitioner therefore restricts the scope of this petition, seeking the relief of directing the Inquiry Officer to decide the aforesaid two applications. Undisputably, the evidence of the witnesses has already commenced in the inquiry proceedings, as on 12.7.04 the Inquiry Officer has recorded the evidence of one witness and the inquiry is further fixed for recording evidence of other witnesses today i.e. 16.8.04.

We have heard learned Advocate General appearing on behalf of the

respondents, who has submitted on the merits of the petition. However, as the learned counsel for the petitioner has restricted his submissions in respect of the grounds reproduced above by us, we do not advert to the submissions made by the learned Advocate General.

We, accordingly, direct the Inquiry Officer to decide the applications submitted by the petitioner dated 7.5.04 and 18.6.04 as expeditiously as possible.

Since we do not find any further reason to interfere in this petition, the petition is dismissed with the aforesaid observations. There shall be no order as to costs.

P.V. HARDAS, J.

N.A. BRITTO, J.

sl.